

CALIFORNIA CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION

**Thursday, May 17, 2001
Employment Development Department
722 Capitol Mall
Auditorium
Sacramento, CA 95814**

I. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Reiner at 8:50 a.m.

II. Roll Call.

Present were Commissioners Kim Belshé, Susan Lacey, Louis Vismara, Ed Melia, Theresa Garcia and Chairman Reiner.

III. Approval of Minutes, February 15, 2001 State Commission Meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Lacey moved, seconded by Commissioner Vismara to approve the April 19, 2001 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Chairman's Report

Chairman Reiner presented highlights of a recent JAMA article. The June Commission meeting will coincide with the unveiling of the Library Literacy and Books Services project. The first van was introduced in January of 2001 serving San Joaquin County. The Kit for New Parents will be introduced with a press event in July in Los Angeles. Chairman Reiner reported that the Commission staff will be preparing a monthly meeting calendar for 2002. Staff is currently planning for the 2002 statewide conference for March in San Diego. The next planning meeting for the conference will be held June 19th. Chairman Reiner congratulated Bill Carter and Michael Cornez, attorneys representing the Commission in recent litigation involving the tobacco industry.

V. Executive Director's Report

Jane Henderson provided an update on the Master Plan for Education and School Readiness working group. The next meeting will be Friday May 25th. There will be a formal adoption of the scope of work and statement of principles at the next meeting. She highlighted some of the main areas of the report. The five main areas include 1) addressing all dimensions of school readiness (social/emotional, physical, cognitive), 2) assuring all services are of high quality and are equally available, 3) the building of a comprehensive system, 4) managing the system and 5) creating partnerships and defining roles and responsibilities. The meetings are open to the public. The meeting dates are

available on the Commission's website. A workgroup handout was distributed to the Commission members and audience. A communication plan has been developed to ensure communication between working groups.

Jane Henderson reported that the Commission's website received more than 300,000 hits during the previous month. The majority of these hits are from AOL members which suggests the hits are from the general public.

She also reported that there was a recent confidentiality workgroup that addressed the sharing of information while protecting confidentiality.

Dr. Henderson next provided a brief update on the Inclusion project. The discussion item has been postponed until further input is received from counties.

VI. County Commission Executive Director's Report

Dorinda Ohnstad reported that the most recent Association meeting was very successful and that the most recent retreat was also very successful. The Diversity Committee has suggested developing further associations with the Association and that the Association plans to look into furthering a relationship with the Diversity Committee.

Dorinda Ohnstad stated that the Association website will be very robust, containing as much of the Association's work as possible.

The Evaluation Committee is working to jointly launch a pilot evaluation project with the Commission. The Legislative Advocacy Committee recently discussed training counties on how the legislative process works. It has been suggested that the legislative training be linked with a legislative work day, where participants would meet with legislators. The committee also discussed the May revise and the implications for Proposition 10.

The Association is changing its July meeting date in order to participate in the unveiling of the Kit for New Parents.

A brief discussion followed on the topic of the May revise.

VII Kit for New Parents

Joe Munso presented this action item. The Commission considered approval of funding for statewide implementation and distribution of the Kit for New Parents.

MOTION: Chair Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Vismara to approve funding for statewide implementation and distribution of the Kit for New Parents. The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Department of General Services Contract Issues

Janie Daigle explained the difference between a resolution and a motion or action item. This action item considered a resolution designed to address changes in procurement and contracting practices and procedures.

Bryan Hobson presented the resolution. The resolution was read into the record as follows:

Authorization of Executive Director and Executive Director's Designees to Enter Into or Amend Contracts

WHEREAS,

The California Children and Families Commission ("then CCFC" or "the Commission") has as one of its powers and duties the responsibility to enter into such contracts as necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of the California 'Children and Families Act ("the Act"), and

WHEREAS,

The Commission has the responsibility of appointing its Executive Director and hiring such other staff as necessary or appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of the Act, and

WHEREAS,

At the May 10, 1999, meeting of the CCFC the following motion was made and approved:

"The Commission delegates its authority, under H&S Code section 130125(I), to the Interim ED and the ED to enter into contracts for the purpose of Commission operations, such as securing office space, office furniture, computer equipment, telephones, letterhead, fax machines, hiring of office manager, web site, etc. Any purchase or contract above \$25,000 other than the amount to lease office space must be approved by the Commission," and

WHEREAS,

Since May 10, 1999, the Commission has appointed an Executive Director and hired a complement of staff who are charged with the responsibility of carrying out the day-to-day operations of the CCFC, and

WHEREAS,

In order to more effectively and efficiently carry out the day-to-day operations of the CCFC, and because of the expanded size and scope of the administrative and programmatic functions of the Executive Director and the CCFC staff, the need has arisen to amend the language of the May 10, 1999, motion, quoted above, so as to increase the Executive Director's delegated expenditure authority from \$25,000 to \$150,000 and to expand the Executive Director's contracting authority to include contracts for administrative and consultative purposes.

WHEREAS,

To date the Commission has not expressly conferred signature authority to the Executive Director and his/her designees for the purpose of executing all contracts and other legal documents on behalf of the Commission,

NOW IT BE RESOLVED,

That the Commission hereby confers signature authority to the Executive Director and his/her designees for the purpose of executing all contracts and other legal documents on behalf of the Commission, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,

That the Commission amends the motion passed May 10, 1999, and hereby delegates its authority, under H&S Code section 130125(i), to the Executive Director and his/her designees to enter into or amend contracts for administrative and consultative purposes on the conditions that each contract 1) does not exceed \$150,000; and 2) is deemed by the Executive Director as being necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of the California Children and Families Act, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,

That for contracts in excess of \$150,000 and after the Commission has approved expenditure authority, the Commission hereby delegates to the Executive Director and his/her designees the authority to award and enter into or amend such contracts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,

That all contracts awarded, entered into, or amended by the Executive Director, or her designee, prior to the passage of this Resolution, be expressly ratified by the Commission.

MOTION: Chair Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Belshé to make the following amendments to the resolution:

Under the 5th whereas "...expand the Executive Director's contracting authority to include contracts for programmatic, as well as administrative, purposes and consultative purposes." be changed to read "...expand the Executive Director's contracting authority to include contracts for administrative and consultative purposes."

Under the 1st be it further resolved "...Executive Director and his/her designees to enter into or amend contracts for administrative and consultative purposes..." be changed to "...Executive Director and his/her designees to enter into or amend contracts for administrative and consultative purposes..."

The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Commissioner Lacey moved, seconded by Chair Reiner to adopt the amended Resolution. The motion passed unanimously.

IX. Communications

This item became moot as a result of the above resolution.

X. Forecasting Model – Revenue Estimates

Joe Munso presented this discussion item. The Commission considered a proposal to contract for a consultant to develop and implement a forecasting model for predicting tobacco revenues based on information from the Board of Equalization and others.

Chairman Reiner asked about the nature of partnerships with individual county commissions. Joe Munso informed the Commission that it would be the responsibility of the State Commission to fund the consultant. If the local commissions wanted a more localized model, then that commission might be expected to help fund that model.

Commissioner Belshé asked for clarification on the disparity between the Department of Finance's estimates and the State Commission's estimates. Joe Munso informed the Commission that it requires a more accurate model, as well as one that predicts further into the future.

XI. Preparation of CCFC's Budget

Joe Munso presented this discussion item. Mr. Munso provided an update on the approved and proposed initiatives/projects and their potential impact on the CCFC budget. Mr. Munso presented the following budget development options. The following options assume a Governor's Budget May Revise Adjustment of \$30 million for one year (FY 2001/02). With this assumption, the total funds available for commitment over a three-year period (FY 2001/02, 2002/03 and 2003/04) would be approximately \$88.6 million.

Option 1

Fund the renewal of existing projects, based on staff recommendations, with the exclusion on the \$15 million for media and the \$3 million for public relations for FY 2003/04. The Commission has allocated \$126 million for these two activities through December 2003. We recommend that we extend the contract until June 2004 and expend the \$126 million over three and a half years versus three. This option would commit funding totaling \$79.5 million.

Pros:

- Provides a spending plan over the next three years.
- Allows initiative "sponsors/owners" sufficient lead-time to pursue other funding sources to continue initiative in the future.
- Obligates funding. This may reduce the possible use of CCFC funds in State Budget Process.

Cons:

- Limits the ability of the Commission to fund any new projects under current consideration.
- Lesson the ability of the Commission to respond to emerging needs or projects for a period of 3 years.
- Does not allow for additional funding commitment to School Readiness initiatives.

Option 2

Fund the renewal of existing projects, based on staff recommendations, for FFY 2001/02 only, and use the budget calendar process to deliberate the 2002/03, 2003/04 budget, utilizing the Commissioner rankings. This one-year commitment of funding totals approximately \$30 million.

Pros:

- Provides funding to ensure continuance of critical projects for 2001/02.
- Provides flexibility to Commission to allow for possible new projects beginning in July 2002.
- Provides flexibility for a larger investment in School Readiness Initiative.
- Prudent approach during uncertain times associated with revenue levels and state budget deliberations.

Cons:

- Does not obligate all funds. This creates the potential for the redirection of CCFC funds in future State Budget processes.
- May be a hardship for initiative partners, as it may hinder them from entering into staffing or contract agreements.

Option 3

Utilize the rankings of projects by the Commissioners to establish a spending plan.

Pros:

- Allows Commissioners to establish their priorities through full consideration of all proposed initiatives/projects.
- Would establish up to a 3 year spending plan.
- Obligates funding. This may reduce the possible use of CCFC funds in State Budget Process.

Cons:

- May result in cancellation of existing programs.
- Could result in inability for Commission to respond to emerging needs or projects for a period of 3 years.

Option 4

Await the outcome of the 2001/02 State Budget Process, and reassess next steps in July 2001 based on revenue forecasts and Governor's Budget decisions. Interim decisions could be made to provide ongoing funding for current initiatives whose funding and contract terms are expiring over the next few months.

Pros:

- Prudent approach during uncertain times associated with revenue levels and state budget deliberations.
- Allows Commission to assess budget/spending plan with more accurate information as to available revenue forecasts, or changes contained in the final state budget.
- Allows Commission to address critical initiative decisions prior to making a full decision on a spending plan.

Cons:

- Delays development of 2001/02 Budget and Business Plan.
- Potential delays to start up of new initiatives.
- Perception of lack of direction/purpose from the State Commission on the use of its resources.

Through discussion, it was made clear that the request made of the Commissioners to rank the various proposals before them requires the Commissioners to rank the proposals as concepts rather than specific proposals.

The discussion then turned to the Governor's proposed May Revision to the State Budget.

Chairman Reiner stated that the proposed use of \$25 million for stage 1 child care (CalWORKs) does not further the goals of Proposition 10 and recommended the Commission take a position of non-support.

Commissioner Belshé stated that an argument could be made that there is not a General Fund crisis. Commissioner Belshé outlined several principles identified earlier by the Commission under which the Commission should proceed. One is a clear alignment with the priorities of the State and county commissions and is consistent with the mission of Proposition 10. Second is that the proposed item is supplemental rather than supplanting. Third is that the funding be one-time only and not be used to fund baseline programs or caseload growth.

Commissioner Melia stated that it is important that the Commission maintain its independence with respect to how Proposition 10 funds are allocated. He noted that precedents set here should be carefully developed.

Public Comment

Don Feretti, Commissioner, Placer County Children and Families Commission, suggested that funding allocation should be closely matched with successes identified by results data.

Mary Emmonds, Los Angeles Children's Institute, suggested the budget focus more on children at risk. Ms. Emmond noted that there has been millions of CalWorks surplus dollars and that it is these funds that should be used for child care.

Donita Stromgren, California Child Care Resource and Referral Network, spoke in opposition of Proposition 10 funds being used to fulfill General Fund obligations. Ms. Stromgren stated that her members are concerned with the development of assessment tools for school readiness. Ms. Stromgren urged the Commission to partner with other organizations in furthering Proposition 10 goals.

Pam Shaw, WestEd stated that child screening should be done at 3 years of age rather than at 5 years of age. This would allow for early intervention. Ms. Shaw said that West ED would be presenting proposals to the Commission in the next few months. She emphasized focusing on collaboration when making funding decisions.

Shawndra Miller, California Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems, spoke in support of funding oral health programs.

Marsha Sherman, California Child Care Health Program, spoke in support of the notion of identifying how existing programs can benefit each other through the sharing of their results.

XII. Legislative Items

Patti Huston presented this action item. The Commission considered the following bills:

Non-Commission-sponsored bills:

AB 1105 (Simitian & Shelley) – Child Care Assistance for Foster Families. This bill would provide child care assistance for foster children cared for by foster parents and relative caregivers. It would require the Department of Social Services (DSS) to establish and administer a child care payment program.

Staff recommended a position of support.

MOTION: Chairman Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Lacey to adopt a position of support for AB 1105 with the provision that foster family homes be included in the provisions of the bill.

Mary Emmonds spoke in support of foster family care funding.

Based on questions from the Commission members and public comment received, Chairman Reiner tabled this item until the next Commission meeting, and directed staff to look into the possibility of including foster family homes.

AB 1568 (Aroner) – Family Support in Child Care and Development Programs. This bill would enact the California Healthy Families Vaccine Purchase Act. It would allow the Healthy Families Program to participate in the federal discounted bulk purchase of childhood vaccines.

Staff recommended a position of watch.

MOTION: Chairman Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Lacey to adopt a position of watch for AB 1568 (Aroner). The motion passed unanimously.

SB 1038 (Polanco) – California Healthy Families Vaccine Purchase Act. This bill would establish family support in state-subsidized child care and development programs. It would require the Superintendent of Public Instruction to award grants of up to \$150,000 to state-funded child care and development programs and to local child care planning councils.

Staff recommended a position of support.

Commissioner Belshé requested that this bill be brought back before the Commission next month in order to provide more time to better determine whether there is currently a problem facing participating and prospective physicians in the Healthy Families Program concerning the provision of vaccines.

Commission sponsored bills:

AB 734 (Chan) is the Commission's School Readiness bill. It passed the Assembly with no opposition. The Commission can make amendments to this bill by July 13th to meet the deadlines to move the bill this year. Otherwise, it will become a two-year bill.

AB 735 (Chan) is the conflict of interest bill that the State Commission is sponsoring on behalf of County Commissions. It is now co-sponsored by the Orange County Board of Supervisors. This bill passed the Assembly without opposition. It is now on the Senate side awaiting a policy hearing. It is anticipated that the bill will be in effect in January.

XIII. School Readiness Initiative

This discussion item was introduced by Jane Henderson on behalf of Ex Officio Commissioner Theresa Garcia. According to Ms. Garcia, given the revised budget forecast and the decreases from the January budget in other areas, the \$3M in General Fund in the May Revise is evidence of the Governor's commitment to moving forward with this initiative with the state and local Proposition 10 commissions. The budget states that the money is allocated for the support, development and validation of a School Readiness Assessment. It would include teachers and providers; however, Secretary Mazzoni has indicated that she will be convening another meeting of the School

Readiness Task Force to discuss how this funding could best be used to accomplish this goal.

Roberta Peck led the discussion of the School Readiness Initiative Discussion Paper. Initial work is being done in collaboration with the county commissions. Some of this work includes an initial set of questions and answers regarding policy and timing issues. The planning group will continue to work with the Governor's Task Force. Ms. Peck presented the Commission with a timeline of the planning group's work. The timeline was distributed to the Commission for discussion.

Patricia Skelton provided a summary of the statistics for the School Readiness Initiative and the identification of possible target populations. Ms. Skelton distributed a handout to the Commission.

Commissioner Vismara asked how these data are reflective of the challenges and needs of children with special needs and other disabilities. Ms. Skelton informed the Commission that with respect to API, the data would not be reflective. With respect to population the data would be reflective. Commissioner Vismara asked for recommendations from Ms. Skelton on how this data could be made reflective of children with special needs and other disabilities.

Commissioner Belshé inquired how incentive grants would be structured. Dr. Henderson informed the Commission that the planning group is still discussing this topic and hopes to bring several options before the Commission. She then presented several options for how the resources could be targeted. Option one involved building on existing programs. Option two involved targeting those with greatest need. Option three involved targeting schools that have shown the most progress.

Chairman Reiner opined there should be a mixture of these and other options.

Commissioner Vismara asked if it would be a bad thing for a county to go through an extensive planning process even if they were not recipients from the Commission. He inquired and asked if the Commission had plans to fund a planning process.

Commissioner Belshé suggested development of RFPs that speak to goals associated with school readiness and see what comes forward. Dr. Henderson noted that this proposal would be easier to accomplish than other approaches under consideration.

Chairman Reiner asked how long it would take to get evaluation tools together. Dr. Henderson informed the Commission that staff would be putting out an RFP this summer and would be selecting a contractor in October. The contractor would then build on what was already being developed. Staff would like to have goals defined within the application process.

Commissioner Vismara suggested that the disadvantages to adopting an existing

framework be identified. Dr. Henderson informed the Commission that the only downside she could identify at this moment would be the need for those willing to enter into the initiative now without knowing the specific elements of the evaluation component.

Chairman Reiner noted that getting some centers up and running now would be good for public relations.

Dr. Henderson stated that it takes time to build all of the required components into the system to ensure that the Commission's goals are met.

Commissioner Belshé identified the schools' readiness as a key component in terms of both the evaluation and the overall testing.

Commissioner Vismara proposed convening a panel of experts on the existing models to inform the Commission on some of these processes.

Public Comment

Brenda Blasingame informed the Commission that her commission has spent a lot of time discussing the school readiness issue. She emphasized the importance of community and the feeling of ownership and inclusive governance, and also emphasized the importance of partnerships in achieving the school readiness goals.

Donita Stromgren suggested the inclusion in the proposal process of existing services in the community.

XIV. Advisory Committee on Diversity

Commissioner Vismara provided a report on the recent Advisory Committee on Diversity retreat. Attendance was very strong and the retreat very productive. The purpose of the retreat was to affirm the committee's mission, purpose and role. Another purpose was for the members of the committee to obtain a deeper understanding of how it is positioned in relation to the state Commission, which is its primary audience, and also how it can collaborate with secondary audiences such as the county commissions and other stakeholders and constituencies. Yet another purpose was to crystallize and clarify the vision, principles and beliefs that will guide the committee's work. And finally, to identify next steps and action plans by which these visions and beliefs can be implemented into real steps.

The first day of the retreat focused on broad aspects such as what will guide the work of the committee as well as developing elements of a shared vision for the committee. The consensus among the various working groups was the importance of the quality of life of California's children coming from diverse ethnic, linguistic, cultural, economic and special needs and disabilities so that they can triumph and so that the values of the

individuals and the community can be infused in the school readiness component. A number of specific beliefs and values that should guide the work of the committee were identified. There was consensus on the retention of the name Committee on Diversity. The highlight of the first day was Chairman Reiner's presentation on the background of Proposition 10.

Some of the common themes identified were the importance of establishing timelines and action plans for the committee, the opportunity and the importance of infusing individual, family, cultural and community values, the importance of establishing accountability, evaluation and indicators that are responsive and reflective of diversity in its very broad context, and the importance of infusing the work that the committee is doing with existing groups.

The second day involved four major items in terms of focusing on activities in the next 6 to 9 months. The first was the importance of completing and implementing a committee infrastructure, organizing workgroups that will be able to work with the existing subcommittees. The second was the consensus to focus on school readiness. The third major item was the importance of completing and adopting a diversity tenets document. The fourth was the importance of the Diversity Committee establishing relations and having a direct influence on the media campaign.

Public Comment

Brenda Blasingame spoke on access and equity as it was discussed at the retreat.

XV Communications Director's Report

Roy Behr of Greer, Margolis, Mitchell, Burns & Associates (GMMB), presented this discussion item. The completed interviews include 687 general market interviews, defined as Caucasians and English language API community members, 212 Vietnamese and Chinese, half way through the Korean interviews and at the beginning of the Cambodian and Thai interviews.

People were asked what they thought their most important goals are when they think about raising their own children. The number one issue was raising children that are self confident and emotionally secure. The number two issue was raising children that are good learners and reaching their school potential. There are meaningful differences between the populations. The African American community had a higher occurrence of the "having a better life than me" response. In the English speaking Spanish community the issue of discipline had a higher occurrence. People were asked how much influence during the first three years of their child's life they thought care givers and parents had on their children's ability to learn. The Spanish language and API communities had strikingly lower numbers of respondents answer that they have a great deal of influence.

There is a margin of error on these surveys of 4 to 6 percent.

People were asked how much knowledge they felt they had to help children succeed and do well in school. The Spanish language community responded with a higher occurrence than others that they thought there was not much that they could do in the first three years of the child's life.

People were asked to identify what qualities they thought were important for children to become good learners and do well in school. The general market, African American and English speaking Hispanics are all reasonably similar. Self confident, good listeners and follow instructions were all at the top of the list.

People were asked what sources they would be most likely to listen to and trust about activities that help children become good learners and reach their potential in school. The general market audience responded with a wide range of trusted sources. The numbers were similar in the African American community. In the Spanish language and API communities there was a much greater amount of credibility in the scientific community rather than the experiential community.

People were asked how much time they spent reading to their children and how much time they spent playing with their children. The English speaking Spanish community reported lower levels of reading.

The survey attempted to find out what types of child care arrangements exist in the different households. Population differences were found to be present. There was a heavier reliance on relatives in the Hispanic community. In the API community there was a dramatically lower number reporting that only parents provide child care.

People were asked about their level of satisfaction with child care. People reported generally high levels of satisfaction with their own child care arrangement, but that everyone else has lower child care standards/arrangements.

The focus groups revealed that most people agreed that it is better for the child to stay home with the parent rather than go to day care. The API population differed from that conclusion. Most people were far more comfortable with the idea of preschool.

The survey revealed somewhat lower levels of smoking in both the English and Spanish speaking Hispanics, and somewhat higher levels of smoking in the API population.

The women who reported smoking were asked if they stopped smoking while they were pregnant. Half of the general population did not quit smoking completely during pregnancy. The data show that the target population for this aspect of the campaign would be lower income white women.

Positive statements proved to be more effective than negative when reporting facts about behaviors that affect child care and well being. Data was presented that supported

specific methodologies for message delivery.

XVI Evaluation Update

Elias Lopez initiated this agenda item. The Commission was provided with an update in the form of a handout on three of the evaluation and research activities being developed by the Research Unit. In particular,

- Patricia Skelton is the lead researcher on the evaluation of the School Readiness Initiative;
- Oshi Ruelas is the lead researcher on the County Results and Indicators Initiative; and
- Don Taylor is the lead researcher on the GIS Mapping project.

Don Taylor, a trained epidemiologist, then presented a GIS (geographic information systems) mapping prototype. Mr. Taylor noted that these information systems can empower communities by giving them knowledge about their communities. Mr. Taylor demonstrated some of the GIS techniques used to view data in a novel way. The data was presented in a graphical format, which provided a unique perspective on the data.

XVII. Adjournment

There being no further business, upon motion by Chairman Reiner, seconded by Commissioner Vismara, the meeting adjourned at 4:55pm.